UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,060	05/26/2006	Sandrine Dulac	007035.00008	1280
	7590 02/25/200 WITCOFF, LTD.	9	EXAMINER	
TEN SOUTH V	VACKER DRIVE		SAVAGE, JASON L	
SUITE 3000 CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/596,060	DULAC ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JASON L. SAVAGE	1794	

	JASON L. SAVAGE	1794					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(iii)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			10 133003 101				
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  Discreption (S):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-17 and 18-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/JENNIFER MCNEIL/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that claims 1-4, 6, 11-14 and 17 cannot be anticipated by the prior art of Ueda (JP 2000-303132) because it requires that elements of Ca, Li, Sr and Sc be included in the core alloy in amounts that individually and/or combined would fall outside of the claimed range of "other elements" being present in less than 0.05% each and in total 0.15%.

While a portion of Ueda does recite what Applicant describes, Ueda further teaches that a core alloy of 3003 aluminum was used and that erorion control elements were added individually and in combination to measure the erosion of the core (par [0023-0027]). 3003 aluminum has a nominal composition comprising Cu between 0.05-0.2%, Si 0.6%, Fe 0.7%, Mn 1.0-1.5% and Zn 0.10% which are all elements which may be employed in the claimed aluminum alloy and all fall wihin the claimed ranges for each element. Furthermore, Ueda's Sample No. 9, 10 and 11 exemplify embodiments wherein the errosion control element is Y in amounts of 0.04, 0.12 and 0.58 respectively which would meet the claimed alloy composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticipate the recited claims.

Regarding claims 5, 8-10, 15-16 and 18-20, Applicant reiterates the same argument above that Ueda does not teach or suggest the claimed core alloy. However, as set forth above, Ueda exemplifies embodiments which meet the claimed compositions in claims 1,6 and 11. As such, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.